

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5 and 8 are independent claims. Claims 1, 5, and 8 have been amended herein for clarification of the claims in view of the Examiner's Advisory Action and to support Applicant's Request for Continued Examination submitted August 28, 2008. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by this response.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ et al. ("Russ" U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0068739) in view of Sweatt et al. ("Sweatt" U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0038358). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the cited references and traverses the rejection.

It is respectfully noted that independent claims 1, 5 and 8 recite "displaying the program data related to the history of the viewed broadcasting programs in a list form." It is further respectfully noted that the Examiner, at page 3 of the Office Action, asserts that Russ discloses "displaying the program data related to the history of the viewed broadcasting programs in a list form" and specifically cites Fig. 8 and paragraph 0045. Moreover, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner, at page 3 of the Office Action, further asserts that "Russ states that the user can view the past history for a predetermined amount of time."

However, it is respectfully noted that paragraph 0045 of Russ discloses "displays the current activity for each of the networked receiving devices." It is respectfully submitted that displaying "the current activity" or "the past history" is not analogous to "displaying the program data related to the history of the viewed broadcasting programs in a list form." It is further respectfully noted that Russ Fig. 8 does not illustrate displaying information "in a list form" but rather illustrates displaying information in a network guide screen form.

It is respectfully submitted that Russ fails to disclose "displaying the program data related to the history of the viewed broadcasting programs in a list form," as recited

in independent claims 1, 5 and 8. It is further respectfully submitted that Sweatt also fails to disclose this limitation.

Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1, 5 and 8 are allowable over the cited combination of references. It is further respectfully asserted that claim 6 also is allowable over the cited combination of references at least by virtue of its dependence from allowable claim 5.

RESPONSE TO ADVISORY ACTION

The Examiner asserts in the Advisory Action that Applicant's reply to final Office Action dated 07/29/2008 does not place the application in condition for allowance because the interpretation of cited art, specifically Russ, is analogous to some of the limitations of independent claims 1, 5, and 8. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the cited art and has amended independent claims 1, 5, and 8 to further clarify the limitations therein.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 has been amend to recite "performing an authentication process to display the program data." Support for the amendment can be found at paragraph [0041] of the specification. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration because the cited references, Russ in view of Sweatt, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest performing an authentication process to display the program data, as specified in independent claim 1. In contrast to independent claim 1, Russ paragraph [0026] discloses "parental monitoring may be to control the access to recorded presentations or available television channels by each of the networked remote devices." Thus, Russ only teaches parental monitoring to access recorded presentations or available television channels, instead performing an authentication process to display the program data, as specified in independent claim 1.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Sweatt fails to cure the deficiencies of

Russ with regard to performing an authentication process to display the program data, as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited combination of Russ and Sweatt.

Independent claims 5 and 8 recite limitations similar to independent claim 1 with regard to “performing an authentication process to display the program data.”

Therefore, for the above reasons with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 5 and 8 are also believed to be allowable over the cited combination of references. Accordingly, it is further respectfully submitted that claim 6 is allowable over the cited combination of references at least by virtue of its dependence from allowable independent claim 5.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as originally filed, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & WAIMEY

Date: October 29, 2008

By: 

Vernon R. Yancy
Registration No. 52,379
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884